

श्री मनोहर जोशी:*

श्री उपसभापति: देखिए, जोशी जी, यह बात नहीं है।... (व्यवधान)... नारायणसामी जी, ... (व्यवधान)... Mr. Narayanasamy, please sit down. देखिए, जोशी जी, आपको जो भी सदन में उठना है, रूल्स है, आपको इजाजत है, आप उठ सकते हैं। अगर यह मामला उठना है तो आप रूल्स के हिसाब से नोटिस दीजिए और उठाइए।... (व्यवधान)...

श्री एस०एस० अहलुवालिया:*

श्री उपसभापति: वह नोटिस इसके ऊपर नहीं था।... (व्यवधान)... आप कल नोटिस दीजिए। ... (व्यवधान)... उसके ऊपर नोटिस दीजिए... (व्यवधान)... नोटिस दीजिए।... (व्यवधान)... आप क्या करना चाहते हैं?... (व्यवधान)... क्या चाहते हैं, बोलिए आप... (व्यवधान)... होम मिनिस्टर यहां नहीं हैं, मैं क्या उनको यहां बुलाऊं?... (व्यवधान)... होम मिनिस्टर यहां नहीं हैं। ... (व्यवधान)... आकर कैसे बताएंगे? रूल नहीं है। आप कह रहे हैं कि गृह मंत्री आएँ ... (व्यवधान)... Ahluwaliaji, you are a senior member. You know the rules very well.... (interruptions) वह तो बोल दिया है। कितनी बार बोलेंगे?... (व्यवधान)... कितनी बार आप बोलेंगे?... (व्यवधान)... उसके ऊपर नोटिस दो।... (व्यवधान)... आप नोटिस दीजिए।... (व्यवधान)... आप जो कह रहे हैं, गृह मंत्री आकर बताएंगे लेकिन किस रूल के तहत बताएं?... (व्यवधान)... आप बोलिए, रूल कोट कीजिए, जिस रूल के ऊपर गृह मंत्री यहां... (व्यवधान)... Mr. Naik आप बोलिए।... (व्यवधान)...

THE INDIAN TELEGRAPH (AMENDMENT) BILL, 2006—Contd.

SHRI SHANTARAM LAXMAN NAIK (Goa): Sir, I rise to support the Indian Telegraph (Amendment) Bill, 2006... (Interruptions). This Bill has a very limited scope... (Interruptions). This Bill seeks to replace the words "Obligation to provide access to basic telegraph services"... (Interruptions) Now, Sir... (Interruptions).

श्री उपसभापति: अब छोड़िए। आप मेहरबानी करके चुप रहिए।... (व्यवधान)...

श्री एस०एस० अहलुवालिया (झारखंड): आपकी सरकार को** इसलिए हम इस सदन से वाक आउट करते हैं।

*Not recorded.

**Expunged as ordered by the Chair.

श्री मनोहर जोशी (महाराष्ट्र): सर, हम इस विषय पर वाक आउट करते हैं।... (व्यवधान)... यह बड़े दुर्भाग्य की बात है कि सरकार को फांसी देने के लिए अपनी भूमिका... (व्यवधान)... मैं नहीं समझता कि इसका मतलब क्या होता है?... (व्यवधान)... यह दुर्भाग्य की बात है कि इस देश में कुछ लोग ऐसे भी हैं जो यह नहीं चाहते कि... (व्यवधान)... इसलिए हम इसके ऊपर वाक आउट करते हैं।

[तत्पश्चात् कुछ माननीय सदस्य सदन से उठकर बाहर चले गए]

SHRI SHANTARAM LAXMAN NAIK: Sir, as I was saying, this Amendment has a very limited scope as it is restricted to a specific area. However, taking advantage of this limited amendment, I would like to express a few views regarding telegraphic aspects in general.

Sir, the story of Indian Telegraphs dates back to 1853 when the 33 km. line was laid between Calcutta and Diamond Harbour. Since then this country has marched to a great extent in this field as, presently, we are one of the largest telecommunication operating countries in Asia with 22,000 exchanges. Now, Sir, we had that old black telephone instrument, a precious instrument, in a few houses though. I recollect, in our films also, there were songs sung on that old, black instrument. I would like to share a few lines of that song with the House. The song goes like this:

“मेरे पिया गए रंगून,

किया है वहां से टेलीफोन,

तुम्हारी याद सताती है।”

This was a classic song sung on that black telephone. Then, late Shri Salil Chaudhury, in film *Sujata*, gave us this song which was sung on the same old instrument:

“जलते हैं जिसके लिए

तेरी आंखों के दीये,

दूँद लाया हूँ वही,

गीत मैं तेरे लिए।”

Sir, this is the background of this telephone industry.

Now, we have formulated a new policy, the Telecom Policy of 1999. When this was being announced, it was said on behalf of the Government that the privatisation in 1999. (*Interruptions*) of telecom industry was not satisfactory to the extent required. This is what was being said when this policy was announced. Now, Sir, six-seven years have passed after the 1999 Telecom Policy was announced. We would like to know the latest situation from the hon. Minister so far as this policy is concerned, whether the privatisation which has been done has been satisfactory and to what extent.

I was noting one thing. We have several legislations on telegraph. For example, this very legislation is the Indian Telegraph Act of 1885. Then, we have the Indian Wireless Act of 1983. Then, there is the Telecom Regulatory Authority Act of 1997. I was wondering why all these legislations could not be consolidated to make it one single legislation. I find that there was one such legislation called the Communication Convergence Bill, 2001 in which all these legislations were incorporated. But I am not aware of the fate of that legislation. I am told that it has been shelved. But, in principle, I would like to submit that we should have one single legislation covering all the aspects of our telecom industry. I can understand that there has to be a separate legislation like the Information Technology Act, 2000 because information technology needs a separate and independent treatment. But, as far as the other aspects are concerned, they have to be included in one single legislation.

The other thing is that today mobile phones have become very common. At one time, we used to say that a mobile phone is a privilege of the elite. Today, you find average people, labourers, industrial workers, taxi drivers and common office-goers possessing mobile phones in a budget of just three hundred or so rupees a month. Therefore, what they used to say five years ago, that it is a privilege of the elite, is no more true. Everybody finds it a very valuable instrument to possess. Earlier, whenever you travelled in trains, you always felt you were out of touch with your families. Today, it is

not so. Most of the time in most of the trains, you remain in constant touch with your families. So, this mobile phone is a new aspect of the technology which is being used by common people.

Then, Sir, we have seen that during natural calamities like floods, mobile services do not work. Who is responsible to jam mobile phone networks during those times? Then, the department says, when several thousands of users of mobile phones try to use the services at the same time, jamming takes place. As a result, we don't get the network. Is it that, or, for some other reasons, the security people try to put obstacles by jamming it? If a person cannot use his mobile in emergency, then, it is of no use to him. Therefore, in this aspect, my request to the hon. Minister is, you have to have a particular policy and a particular instrument which will make all mobiles workable during disasters. Secondly, when we spread the network of mobiles, we should also see it from security aspect. If, in certain areas, the tribal people are affected and the innocent people are massacred, then the mobile services should be strengthened in those areas. Although the people in those areas may be using less and less of such instruments, yet, for the security of those people, for their connectivity, mobile services should be provided in those areas. Sir, you are talking of the broadband. But, its coverage and intensity is not very satisfactory. Earlier, we were told that the moment you click it, the downloading will be there. But, that does not happen. Therefore, I request the hon. Minister to kindly look into this aspect.

Sir, another point I want to raise is this. Sir, we have been provided a good instrument. I would like to point out, if it is permitted by rules....(Interruptions)...

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY (Pondicherry): It is not working.

SHRI SHANTARAM LAXMAN NAIK: Yes. The question is, the connectivity of this instrument is not very satisfactory. Number two, apart from the Internet facility on this telephone, if the BSNL also provides FAX connectivity on it, then, it will be very useful. Supposing, we are on

a tour, and if somebody from our State or outside tells us that such and such work is pending and something has to be done, or, there is some emergency, in that case, we can type four-five lines and send it by FAX, wherever we may be. If FAX connectivity is given on this instrument, it will be useful. It is very easy, Sir. Other companies like Idea and Airtel are providing the FAX connectivity. Only the BSNL is not providing it. As a result, we are suffering. It is very easy to provide it. Not much technology is involved in it. So, I urge upon the hon. Minister, and I also urge upon you, Sir, to do the needful in this matter.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: If they don't charge, we will allow it.

SHRI SHANTARAM LAXMAN NAIK: So, I request the hon. Minister to provide FAX connectivity on our mobiles.

Then, Sir, there are many cases in which the people object to erecting of towers. I have experienced it in Goa. When the towers are erected, the village people object to it. They say that these towers discharge some radio activity which is harardous for health. So, we have to educate the people about the real aspect of it. I was told by a technologist, that if we have more towers, then, the radio activity or whatever emanating from the instrument is less because the tower is closer to you. The people are objecting to erecting of towers in villages. I want to know from the hon. Minister whether it is health hazardous or not. If it is health hazardous, then, the people will not allow you to erect it. Everywhere you don't get mountains for erecting towers; everywhere you don't get areas which are not inhabited. At many places, in the midst of population, you have to erect towers. So, my request to the hon. Minister is that the people should be educated whether it is health hazardous or not. If at all it is health hazardous, to what extent it is so.

Sir, my next point is this. Earlier, the PCO's role was to the extent of providing telephone service, FAX facility, etc. Now, Sir, PCOs have to be provided with all equipment so that the common man can download the Government orders, gazettes and everything from the PCOs itself. If PCOs are provided with all these equipment, then, an average common man can have all the information about the Government orders, gazettes, etc., the PCOs. Suppose, a man requires a simple form. The PCO should be able to download that form and give it to him for five rupees or three rupees or whatever it is. The PCOs must be able to guide these people. If the

customers require some information about some departments of the Government, then, they should be able to get it. Nowadays, everything is available and will be available on the Internet. Therefore, downloading and giving information to such people will be a new role of the PCOs. The hon. Minister has to do something, in this regard. Sir, another aspect of putting these towers and instruments is the question of right of way.

Sir, the Telecommunication Department has a lot of hurdles. They cannot just install their instruments without permission from so many authorities. It is very difficult for the officers working in the Department to approach all these Departments to get NOCs and other necessary certificates from them and then install these things. A right has to be created in the Central legislation and also in the legislation of the States. The State Governments have to be persuaded to amend their respective legislation so as to facilitate the Department to install its instruments, poles or whatever it is in places without much delay. Otherwise, even after sanctioning of the projects, only this formality takes years together. Therefore, Sir, this aspect has to be looked into from the Central Government's point of view and other points of view.

Lastly, I would like to make a request as far as my State is concerned. You have divided Telecom Circles. How you have divided is like this. My State Goa is entitled for a full-fledged circle. It is a State under the Constitution of India. How can you merge it into Maharashtra Circle? If the Constitution has not merged it because it is an independent State, how this Department can merge Goa into Maharashtra Circle? As a result of this we lose as far as instrument is concerned, we lose as far as financial consideration is concerned. We lose as far as instruments are concerned! When the whole of Maharashtra gets so much share then something is given to Goa. When we are a State under the Constitution of India, however small it may be, each independent State must have a full-fledged Telecom Circle. I hope the hon. Minister will do this in future. Thank you.

श्री सुरेश भारद्वाज (हिमाचल प्रदेश): धन्यवाद उपसभापति महोदय, मैं "दि इंडियन टेलीग्राफ (अर्मेंडमेंट) बिल, 2006" के विषय में बोलने के लिए खड़ा हुआ हूँ। महोदय, टेलिफोन आज जनता की एक आवश्यकता बन गया है। हिन्दुस्तान में अरबन एरिया में टेली डेन्सिटी 32 प्रतिशत से अधिक है। आज ग्रामीण क्षेत्रों में जिस प्रकार से कृषि क्षेत्र दिन-प्रतिदिन नीचे की ओर जा रहा है, उसी प्रकार से जिस प्रकार की भी सेवाएं ग्रामीण क्षेत्रों को मिलनी चाहिए, वे कम होती जा रही

है। जितनी भी पालिसीज बनती हैं, सरकार घोषणाएं करती है, उनमें ग्रामीण क्षेत्रों में सभी प्रकार की सुविधाएं अधिक से अधिक दिए जाने की बात की जाती है ताकि ग्रामीण क्षेत्रों से अरबन क्षेत्रों की ओर पलायन रुक सके। आज इस देश का दुर्भाग्य यह है कि जो गांव में बसता है, उस गांव की ओर हमारी अनदेखी होती है। 1999 में हिन्दुस्तान के रूरल एरियाज की टेली डेन्सिटी 0.2 प्रतिशत थी। उस समय जो पालिसी तैयार की गई थी, उसमें यह बढ़कर 2010 तक 4 प्रतिशत पहुंचनी चाहिए थी, लेकिन आज 2007 प्रारंभ होने को है और अभी भी रूरल एरियाज की टेली डेन्सिटी 2 प्रतिशत तक भी नहीं पहुंच पाई है। सन् 2003 में जब टेलीग्राफ एक्ट का संशोधन किया गया था, उसमें व्यापक संशोधन हुए थे। दुनिया में जिस प्रकार से टेक्नोलाजी का प्रसार बढ़ रहा है, उसमें यह ज्यादा से ज्यादा बढ़ती हुई नजर आ रही है। हिन्दुस्तान में भी इस प्राइवेटाइजेशन के युग में बेसिक टेलीफोन के साथ-साथ सेल्युलर सर्विसेज, मोबाइल टेलीफोन आने आरंभ हुए हैं। हमारा जो टेलीफोन डिपार्टमेंट होता था, वह पहले सार्वजनिक क्षेत्र में काम करता था। पहले जो टेलीफोन सर्विसेज दी जाती थी, उसमें लोगों को बहुत मुश्किल से टेलीफोन मिल पाता था। भारत संचार निगम बना। दिल्ली और मुंबई के लिए एम.टी.एन.एल. महानगर टेलीफोन निगम का निर्माण किया गया। यह इसलिए किया गया था कि आम जनता को इससे सुविधाएं मिलें। बड़े-बड़े नगरों के लिए एम.टी.एन.एल. और बाकी पूरे देश में बी.एस.एन.एल. काम करता है, लेकिन दुर्भाग्य यह है कि जिस प्रकार से रूरल एरियाज की टेली डेन्सिटी बढ़नी चाहिए, उस हिसाब से नहीं बढ़ी है। आज रूरल एरियाज में बी.एस.एन.एल. का नाम ही बदल गया है। BSNL का नाम हो गया है — “भाई साहब नहीं लगेगा” और शहरों में जो MTNL है, उसका भी नाम इसी प्रकार का बन गया है ... (व्यवधान)...

संचार और सूचना प्रौद्योगिकी मंत्रालय में राज्य मंत्री (डा. शकील अहमद): हम इसको “भाई साहब निश्चित लगेगा”, यह बनाएंगे, यह मैं बताना चाहता हूं।

श्री सुरेश भारद्वाज: जब यह बन जाएगा, तो “नहीं” का “निश्चित” बना दें... (व्यवधान)...

श्री एस.एस. अहलुवालिया: यानी मंत्री जी ने मान लिया कि “नहीं” लग रहा है, इसीलिए “निश्चित” बना रहे हैं ... (व्यवधान)... मान लिया है आपने ... (व्यवधान)...

डा. शकील अहमद: नहीं माना है।

श्री एस.एस. अहलुवालिया: आपने मान लिया है, बहुत अच्छा है।

श्री सुरेश भारद्वाज: महोदय, MTNL की भी ऐसी ही स्थिति है, क्योंकि MTNL से हमारा रोजाना का सरोकार रहता है। हमको डालफिन की मोबाइल सर्विसेज दे रखी हैं और यहां पर घरों में भी टेलीफोन लगा हुआ होता है, लेकिन जो आम जनता, यहां पर आती है, वह कहती है कि

हमको MTNL का कनेक्शन नहीं मिल रहा है, क्या हो रहा है, कैसे बन रहा है? आज इसका भी नाम बदल गया है। आज MTNL का नाम हो गया है - "मेरा टेलीफोन नहीं लगता"। अब इसको भी मंत्री जी कुछ और बदलेंगे, ऐसी उम्मीद हम जरूर करते हैं।

उपसभापति जी, आज जो यह संशोधन आया है, यह केवल एक शब्द का संशोधन है, सैक्शन (3) में "बेसिक" को वे हटा देना चाहते हैं, क्योंकि 2003 में जो संशोधन लाया गया था, उसमें एक फंड का निर्माण किया गया था। Universal Service Obligation Fund, जिसको USO फंड कहा जाता है। टेलीफोन से जो रेवेन्यू जनरेट होता है, उससे ही एक फंड क्रियेट किया गया था, ताकि उससे जो हमारे देश के ग्रामीण और दूरस्थ क्षेत्र हैं, वहां पर हम ये सेवाएं उपलब्ध करवा सकें; लेकिन दुर्भाग्यवश आज उन सेवाओं की ओर ध्यान नहीं दिया जा रहा है। हिमाचल प्रदेश, यानी जिस प्रदेश से मैं आता हूं, टेलीफोन की दृष्टि से वहां शायद देश के अन्य प्रदेशों से ज्यादा अच्छी स्थिति है, क्योंकि हमारे संचार मंत्री उस प्रदेश से रहे हैं, लेकिन वहां पर भी आज अगर किसी टेलीफोन एक्सचेंज को लगवाने के लिए बात करनी हो, जो इन्होंने अपनी स्कीम में व्यवस्था बना रखी थी, आज वे कहते हैं कि हमारे पास स्टोर नहीं हैं, यानी इनके पास कोई equipment नहीं है, वहां पर काम करने के लिए आदमी नहीं है, कोई दूसरी चीज नहीं है। अगर कहीं वे एक्सचेंज लगे भी हैं, तो उनको ठीक करने के लिए equipments दिल्ली और बंगलौर से जाते हैं, वे भी आज वहां पर पहुंच नहीं पा रहे हैं। यह इस समय की स्थिति है। USO फंड से जो पैसा मिलना चाहिए था, इनके पास अभी भी उस फंड में 10,000 करोड़ रुपए से अधिक पैसा है, लेकिन वर्ष 2002 से आज तक केवल 3,300 करोड़ रुपया ही इस काम के लिए रिलीज़ किया गया है और स्टैंडिंग कमेटी के सामने इनके डिपार्टमेंट का जो evidence हुआ है, उसमें भी इन्होंने इस बात को माना है कि हमने 2005 में 3,500 करोड़ रुपए मांगे थे, लेकिन उसमें से केवल 1,500 करोड़ रुपए ही दिए गए हैं और आज इस "बेसिक" शब्द को हटाने की बात की जा रही है। इसका अभिप्राय यह है कि USO फंड का उपयोग ये मोबाइल सर्विसेज़ के लिए, सेलुलर सर्विसेज़ के लिए भी कर सकें। मैं समझता हूं कि यह बहुत भारी साजिश है। हमने tele density को बढ़ाने के लिए प्रयास किए हैं। इनका अपना एक डाक्यूमेंट है, जिसके मुताबिक इनके सेक्रेटरी ने कहा है कि वर्ष 2010 से पूर्व 2,000 की पापुलेशन वाले जो गांव हैं, वहां तक टेलीफोन पहुंचें, लेकिन आज भी देश के 70 प्रतिशत गांवों में टेलीफोन की सुविधा नहीं है। हर गांव में एक BPT टेलीफोन लगाया जाएगा, ताकि वह सारे गांव के लोगों के लिए सुविधा प्रदान कर सके। अलग-अलग क्षेत्रों में अलग-अलग कंपनियों को यह काम दिया गया था, लेकिन भारत संचार निगम, जिसका नाम किसी और कारण से मैंने जो बताया है, वह हो गया है, लेकिन चूंकि वह public enterprise है, public company है, इसलिए उन्होंने BPT पहुंचाए हैं, लेकिन किसी भी प्राइवेट कंपनी ने, उनकी जो अपनी obligation थी BPT पहुंचाने की, वह कहीं पर भी नहीं पहुंचाया गया है।

आज भी स्थिति यह है कि देश के जो अधिकांश गांव हैं, उनमें टेलीफोन की सुविधा नहीं मिली है। अब आज इस फंड को, जो उस काम के लिए, जो हमारी लाईस बिछ कर लगती थी, ऑप्टिकल फाइबर लगा कर बिछती थी, जहां पर टेलीफोन एक्सचेंज लगती थी, उसमें कुछ लोग काम करने वाले होते थे, उनको रोजगार मिलता था, वह सारा काम खत्म किया जा रहा है। यह ठीक है कि जो मोबाइल सर्विस provide करते हैं, उसमें cost कम आएगी, लेकिन आज गांवों के उन क्षेत्रों में, जहां पर लोगों ने टेलीफोन देखा तक नहीं है, आप उनको मोबाइल सर्विसेज किस प्रकार provide करेंगे? जब आप टेलीफोन देते हैं, तो आप equipment साथ देते हैं। क्या मंत्री जी यह सुनिश्चित करने की कृपा करेंगे कि जब मोबाइल सर्विसेज के लिए यूएसओ फंड से पैसा दिया जाएगा, तो मोबाइल टेलीफोन का जो instrument है, वह भी जनता को देंगे? आप टेलीफोन सर्विसेज में इस प्रकार का instrument देते हैं, क्या आप इसमें भी देंगे? यह पैसा, public money, जो आपके पास एक particular purpose के लिए दिया गया था और basically, Parliamentary Standing Committee में इनके अपने डिपार्टमेंट ने इस बात को माना है कि जिस काम के लिए यूएसओ फंड को बनाया गया था, निर्माण किया गया था, पार्लियामेंट की जो नीयत थी, उसके विपरीत आज यह संशोधन किया जा रहा है। मोबाइल सर्विस के लिए सेलुलर, सर्विस के लिए भी यूएसओ फंड के उपयोग करने की जो बात की जा रही है, मैं समझता हूं कि संसद की उस समय की जो इच्छा थी, यह उसको भी violate करने वाली है। Parliamentary Standing Committee में यह observation है और आपके सेक्रेटरी का इस प्रकार का बयान है। पार्लियामेंट जो एक बात तय करती है, पार्लियामेंट की जो नीयत होती है, उसके विपरीत आपके विभाग को केवल प्राइवेट ऑपरेटर्स के साथ मिल कर कुछ काम करने के लिए इस प्रकार की amendments करने की आवश्यकता पड़ रही है। आप सेलुलर टेलीफोन के लिए प्राइवेट ऑपरेटर्स के लिए पब्लिक मनी का उपयोग करेंगे, इससे उनको आप subsidise करेंगे, इससे इस यूएसओ फंड को बनाने के पीछे जो मंशा थी, वह मंशा ही समाप्त हो जाती है। Parliamentary Standing Committee में भी अधिकांश सदस्यों ने इसके लिए dissenting note दे रखे हैं, लेकिन उसके बावजूद भी डिपार्टमेंट इस संशोधन को करना जरूरी समझता है। वैसे तो TRAI ने शायद यह कहा था कि इस संशोधन की आवश्यकता भी नहीं है, लेकिन उसके बावजूद भी डिपार्टमेंट इस संशोधन को लेकर यहां आया है। मैं समझता हूं कि अगर हिन्दुस्तान में हमें प्रत्येक गांव तक टेलीफोन पहुंचाना है, अगर हमको ग्रामीण क्षेत्रों की tele-density बढ़ानी है, तो जो बेसिक टेलीफोन लाइन हैं, उसमें आपको subsidise करने की आवश्यकता है। इसीलिए 2002 में इस यूएसओ फंड का निर्माण किया गया था। मैं समझता हूं कि आज इसका संशोधन करके सेलुलर और मोबाइल सर्विसेज देने के पीछे सरकार की मंशा ठीक नहीं लगती है। जब टेलीफोन की बेसिक सर्विसेज लगेगी, तो जो equipment बनाते हैं, उनको भी काम मिलेगा, वे कारखाने भी चलेंगे। वहां पर equipment जाएगा, तो उसमें जो खर्च होगा, उससे भी सरकार को फायदा होगा।

सरकार की अपनी कंपनियां हैं, हिन्दुस्तान केबल्स, वह sick हो गई है, ITI है, जितनी भी सार्वजनिक क्षेत्र की कंपनियां हैं, वे आज समाप्त प्राय हो रही हैं। आप एक चीज़ को खत्म करके privatisation की धुन में WTO के निर्देशानुसार अपने सारे कानूनों को बदल कर हिन्दुस्तान की जो आम जनता गांवों में रहती है, मैं समझता हूं कि उनके साथ धोखा किया जा रहा है उनको टेलीफोन सुविधा पहुंचे, उनको भी कृषि क्षेत्र में मार्केट से संबंध रखना है, तो उनको टेलीफोन पहुंचाया जाना चाहिए। यह मंशा थी टेलीफोन पॉलिसी की, जो बनाई गई थी। लेकिन आज urban क्षेत्र में 32 प्रतिशत है, आप इसे बढ़ाने की कोशिश कर रहे हैं और ग्रामीण क्षेत्र में केवल 2 प्रतिशत teledensity बढ़ रही है, तो मैं समझता हूं कि इस प्रकार का कानून जो आपने यहां पर लाया है, इसका कोई औचित्य नहीं है। मैं इस संशोधन का विरोध करता हूं। धन्यवाद।

श्री वीरेन्द्र भाटिया (उत्तर प्रदेश): माननीय उपसभापति जी, मैं The Indian Telegraph (Amendment) Bill, 2006 का समर्थन करने के लिए यहां पर खड़ा हुआ हूं और इस अवसर का सदुपयोग करते हुए कुछ बातें कहूंगा। बिल में तो केवल एक शब्द का संशोधन होना है, विरोध की कोई गुंजाइश नहीं है। इस में कोई शक नहीं कि अगर आज हम चर्चा करें तो यह कह सकते हैं कि देश में सब से अधिक क्रांति किसी क्षेत्र में हुई है, अगर सचमुच में revolution किसी क्षेत्र में हुआ है, तो वह communication के क्षेत्र में ही हुआ है। महोदय, मुझे यह कहने में गर्व है कि आज की इस क्रांति के सूत्रधार हमारी पार्टी के नेता, हमारी पार्टी के तत्कालीन संचार मंत्री श्री बेनी प्रसाद वर्मा जी हैं, जिन्होंने इस कार्य को प्रारंभ किया था। उसके पूर्व जब तक बेनी प्रसाद वर्मा जी संचार मंत्री नहीं हुए थे, टेलिफोन सर्विसेस में तीन-तीन, चार-चार साल की waiting list होती थी। टेलिफोन कनेक्शन करा लेना, टेलिफोन पा लेना, ऐसा लगता था जैसे फ्री में कार मिल गई हो। लेकिन 1997 में जब बेनी प्रसाद वर्मा जी संचार मंत्री हुए तो उन्होंने इस स्थिति को ध्यान में रखते हुए कि यह एक आधारभूत मांग है, ऐसी आवश्यकता है जो कि आगे आने के लिए आवश्यक है, उन्होंने संचार-क्रांति का प्रारंभ किया। महोदय, यह बात दूसरी है कि आज उसकी परिणति इतनी हो चुकी है, उसका इतना विकास हो चुका है कि जिस की हम कल्पना नहीं कर सकते। इसीलिए मैंने कहा कि सचमुच में हमारे देश ने किसी क्षेत्र में क्रांति की है तो वह संचार के क्षेत्र में की है।

महोदय, मैं वर्तमान मंत्री जी को भी बधाई देना चाहता हूं, लेकिन कुछ समस्याओं के बारे में जरूर कहूंगा जिन का सामना हम लोगों को दिन-प्रतिदिन करना पड़ता है। आपने कहने को तो सेल्युलर फोंस का नेटवर्क बढ़ा दिया है, कहने को तो आप कहते हैं कि सेल्युलर फोंस बी.एस.एन.एल. प्रोवाइड कर रहा है, आप ने सर्विसेस सस्ती कर दी हैं, लेकिन मान्यवर मैं मंत्री जी से कहना चाहूंगा कि आज भी कभी-कभी नहीं, दिन में peak hours में ऐसा होता है जब आप को नंबर मिलता ही नहीं है और उस समय लगता है कि यह सेल्युलर केवल एक खिलौना बनकर रह गया है।

जब भी आवश्यक कार्य होगा और आप कोई नंबर मिलाना चाहेंगे तो टेलिफोन नंबर नहीं मिलेगा, वह व्यक्ति नहीं मिलेगा। मंत्री जी कृपया इस ओर ध्यान दें। अगर आप सेवा का विस्तार करें, उस में किसी को आपत्ति नहीं है, उस के लिए आप बधाई के पात्र हैं, लेकिन आप उस की गुणवत्ता के लिए भी जिम्मेदार हैं। आप यह भी देखें कि जो सर्विसेस प्रोवाइड की जाती हैं, वे **efficient services** होनी चाहिए।

महोदय, एक और बात कहना चाहूंगा कि आज बिजनेस के जितने भी क्षेत्र हैं, सभी लाभ कमाते हैं और **efficient services** देने की बात करते हैं, **efficiency** से कमाते हैं, लेकिन एक आप का ही विभाग है जो **inefficiency** से भी पैसा कमाता है। आप की **wrong calls** होती हैं, टेलिफोन किसी को कर रहे हैं और कॉल दूसरे नंबर पर जा रही है, **consumer** को तो पेमेंट करना ही पड़ेगा, लेकिन आप के खाते में उस कॉल का पैसा जुड़ गया। इस तरह आप का यह एक ऐसा विभाग है जो कि **inefficiency** के नाम पर भी पैसा कमा रहा है। कृपया इसे चैक कीजिए। महोदय, आज मेरा साथ बहुत से संसद सदस्य देंगे कि आप के सेल्युलर फॉस में **wrong calls** की संख्या बढ़ रही है। आप के सेल्युलर फॉस कहीं-कहीं कनेक्ट हो रहे हैं, दूसरी जगह कनेक्ट हो रहे हैं और कभी-कभी बात करते हुए तीसरी जगह कनेक्ट हो रहे हैं। अब यह बात दूसरी है कि जासूसी करना, विरोधी पक्ष के लोगों के टेलिफोन टेप कराना आप का जन्म-सिद्ध अधिकार है। आप ने हमारी पार्टी के नेताओं के फोन टेप कराए... (व्यवधान)... आप को क्या परेशानी है? टेलिफोन टेप नहीं हो रहे हैं? लेकिन जब जन-समुदाय के टेलिफोन बीच में कनेक्ट होते हैं तो फिर वहीं बात कहूंगा कि **inefficiency** होती है, दूसरे की आवाज तीसरे फोन पर जाती है। कृपया इस ओर भी ध्यान दीजिए।

तीसरी बात मैं यह कहना चाहूंगा कि आपने कम्पनीज़ को, कॉर्पोरेट जगत को, बहुत-से टेलीफोन, सेल्युलर फोन मेड सर्विसेज सस्ती दरों पर प्रोवाइड की हैं, लेकिन उनका दुरुपयोग हो रहा है। आखिर किस पर मार जा रही है? आप शाम को चार बजे लंच के लिए जाते हैं या हम जाते हैं या कोई भी जाता है अथवा आप कहीं पर बैठे हुए हैं, उच्च न्यायालय में काम कर रहे हैं या सदन से बाहर जा रहे हैं, कभी ICICI बैंक वाला बोल रहा है, कभी स्टेट बैंक वाला बोल रहा है, तो कभी बिड़ला वाला बोल रहा है, जबकि इन पर भी उच्चतम न्यायालय ने निर्णय दिया है कि इस प्रकार के टेलीफोन कॉल्स नहीं जाने चाहिए, क्योंकि ये आपकी प्राइवेसी को भंग करते हैं और आपके समय का दुरुपयोग करते हैं। उस टेलीफोन से, उस कॉल पर ही, अगर वह कॉल हमारे पास लखनऊ से दिल्ली में आ रही है, तो हमको भी पेमेंट करनी पड़ती है। कृपया इस ओर भी ध्यान दें। जो लोग इस

प्रकार से केवल अपना व्यवसाय बढ़ाने के लिए कार्य कर रहे हैं, इसमें या तो उनकी कॉल हम लोगों को फ्री की जानी चाहिए या उन लोगों से इतना अधिक पैसा चार्ज किया जाना चाहिए कि वे साधारण व्यक्ति को कम-से कम कार्य के समय परेशान न करें, सोते हुए परेशान न करें अथवा ऐसे अवसर पर परेशान न करें, जब वह व्यक्ति किसी और कार्य में व्यस्त हो। ... (व्यवधान)...

श्री अजय मारू (झारखंड): जब आप रोमिंग में होते हैं, जब आप बाहर सोते हैं, तब ... (व्यवधान)...

श्री वीरेन्द्र भाटिया: वही बात मैंने कही। मैंने वही कहा कि जब मैं दिल्ली में हूँ और लखनऊ से कॉल आ रही है, उसका यही तात्पर्य है।

महोदय, तीसरी बात अभी रोमिंग की आ गई। मैं एक बात संसद सदस्यों को मिलने वाली टेलीफोन सुविधा के बारे में भी कहना चाहूंगा। आपने हमें टेलीफोन की सुविधा दी है और हमें दिल्ली का नम्बर दिया है। जब हम अपने गृह क्षेत्र में जाते हैं, जैसे कि मैं लखनऊ का वासी हूँ और जब मैं लखनऊ जाता हूँ, तो मेरा एक बगल वाला बेसिक टेलीफोन से मुझे टेलीफोन करेगा, तब तो वह लोकल कॉल होगी और अगर मैं टेलीफोन करूंगा तो वह STD कॉल मानी जाएगी, क्योंकि वह दिल्ली से होते हुए आएगी ... (व्यवधान) ... और उस पर पूरा चार्ज लगेगा। उसको भी लगेगा और जिस पर कॉल रिसीव होगी, उस पर भी लगेगा। कृपया इस प्रकार की व्यवस्था कीजिए कि ... (व्यवधान) ... हमारे बड़े भाई कह रहे हैं कि दो चिप्स दीजिए या कुछ इस प्रकार की व्यवस्था कीजिए कि जब हम अपने क्षेत्र में जाएं, तो वह हमें लोकल काल में ही काउंट हो। उसमें लोकल कॉल की ही व्यवस्था होनी चाहिए ... (व्यवधान)...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Chips you can provide; telephones we will provide... (Interruptions)...

श्री उदय प्रताप सिंह (उत्तर प्रदेश): सर, मैं माननीय मंत्री जी से यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि यह जो सुझाव है, यह सारे MPs के लिए बहुत हितकर इसलिए होगा ... (व्यवधान) ... सर, आप मान लीजिए कि हम अपने क्षेत्र में हैं और हमको हमारे बगल वाला फोन कर रहा है, तब तो उस पर दिल्ली तक STD चार्ज लग रहा है और हमको रोमिंग का चार्ज लग रहा है। अगर हमें दूसरा चिप हमारे क्षेत्र का दे दिया जाए, तो इससे उसका भी पैसा बचेगा और हमारा पैसा भी। इस पर स्टैंडिंग कमेटी ने अपनी रिपोर्ट भी दी है ... (व्यवधान) ... मैं आपको इसमें बता रहा हूँ कि MPs के सैलरी

और अलाउंसेंज़ वाली जो स्टैंडिंग कमेटी है, उसने यह कहा है कि यह दिया जाए, पर उसमें जाने क्या बात आ रही है कि वह नहीं हो रहा है। जरा इस पर कृपा कीजिए ... (व्यवधान)...

मौलाना ओबैदुल्लाह खान आजमी (मध्य प्रदेश): डॉल्लिफन और MTNL की पोजिशन तो बहुत खराब है ... (व्यवधान) ... एक मिनट में बात नहीं हो पाती ... (व्यवधान) ... एक मिनट में ही कट जाती है ... (व्यवधान) ... इसमें तो हम सब लोग सहमत हैं ... (व्यवधान) ...

مولانا عبید اللہ خان اعظمی : ڈالٹن اور ایمٹی-این-ایل-کی پوزیشن تو بہت خراب ہے۔ مداخلت۔ ایک منٹ میں بات نہیں ہو پاتی۔ مداخلت۔ ایک منٹ میں ہی کٹ جاتی ہے۔ مداخلت۔ اس میں تو ہم سب لوگ سہمت ہیں۔ مداخلت۔

श्री वीरेन्द्र भाटिया: आपने टेलीफोन की सर्विसेज दी है ... (व्यवधान) ... और जैसा अभी श्री शान्ताराम नायक जी ने कहा कि कम-से-कम 24 घंटों में ... (व्यवधान) ...

श्री उपसभापति: यह टेलिग्राफ बिल है ... (व्यवधान) ...

श्री वीरेन्द्र भाटिया: मंत्री महोदय, 24 घंटों में कम-से-कम दो घंटे ऐसे आते हैं, जब आपका instrument काम नहीं करता, आउट ऑफ मेमोरी चला जाता है। कृपया इस पर भी ध्यान दीजिए।

अगली बात बेसिक टेलीफोन सर्विसेज के बारे में है। अब टेलीफोन सर्विसेज पर जैसे ध्यान नहीं दिया जा रहा है, जबकि अभी भी बेसिक टेलीफोन सर्विसेज का जितना जाल है, वह भी कम नहीं है लेकिन आज इस युग में जब आपने BSNL की तरफ ध्यान दिया, सेल्यूलर फोन की तरफ ध्यान दिया, लेकिन अगर आपका बेसिक टेलीफोन खराब हो जाए, तो तीन-तीन दिन तक कोई ठीक करने वाला भी आने वाला नहीं है। ऐसी स्थिति नहीं आनी चाहिए, क्योंकि गाँवों में साधारण जनता के पास और अभी भी सबसे ज्यादा कंज्यूमर्स बेसिक टेलीफोन के हैं। मैं अधिक न कहते हुए, इस बिल का समर्थन करते हुए आपसे अपेक्षा करूँगा कि आप हमारी इन असुविधाओं की ओर ध्यान देंगे। धन्यवाद।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Shri Tapan Kumar Sen. ... (Interruptions) ...

मौलाना ओबैदुल्लाह खान आजमी: सर, मैं सिर्फ एक बात कहूँगा कि जो टेलीफोन होता है, उसमें एक बड़ी शिकायत यह है कि आपके टेलीफोन पर ऑपरेटर लोग दूसरे का टेलीफोन लगवा कर बात करवा देते हैं। उसमें वह चीज़ भी आ जाती है।

† [مولانا عبید اللہ خان اعظمی : سر، میں صرف ایک بات کہوں گا کہ جو ٹیلی فون ہوتا ہے، اس میں ایک بڑی یہ ہے کہ آپ کے ٹیلی فون پر اپریٹر لوگ دوسرے کا ٹیلی فون لگوا کر بات کروا دیتے ہیں۔ اس میں وہ چیز بھی آ جاتی ہے۔]

श्री उपसभापति: यह तो पुरानी बात हो गई।

मौलाना अबुदुल्लाह खान आज़मी: यह है, सर।

† [مولانا عبید اللہ خان اعظمی : یہ ہے، سر]

श्री उपसभापति: यह तो पुरानी बात हो गई।

SHRI DAYANIDHI MARAN: Sir, the discussion should be on the Bill.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That is the problem. On the discussion on the Railway Budget also, there is this problem. Shri Tapan Kumar Sen.

SHRI TAPAN KUMAR SEN (West Bengal): Sir, I would like to bring to your notice the crux of the issue. The Statement of Objects and Reasons of this Bill says that the Bill is mainly for providing financial support from the Universal Service Obligation Fund to the mobile service providers in the rural areas. And, the Bill is in continuity of an Ordinance promulgated on 30th October, 2006, just a month before the Parliament was going to have its Session. So my first point is, what was the need of such a hurry? Heaven would not have fallen had the Ordinance route not been resorted to. There are definitely no two opinions that in the rural and remote areas, the mobile service must spread. This is the most modern system of communication. That must spread. There are just no two opinions about it. But the point is, why is this kind of route resorted to? Why? I don't find any logic in it.

Secondly, when the Bill is aimed at providing the Fund support, 'Sarkari Fund support', the USOF, to the mobile service providers in the rural and remote areas, then what would be the status of that agency which has already been providing mobile services in the rural and remote areas?

†Transliteration in Urdu Script.

Whatever you may say, so called 'भाई साहब नहीं लगते, नहीं, चलते', the fact is that in a country of below two per cent rural teledensity, ninety per cent credit goes to the 'भाई साहब नहीं लगते', the BSNL, for rural telephone infrastructure. Ninety per cent credit goes to them. Even as on date, even after signing the agreement for front loading the subsidy for teleconnection, whatever the rural telegraph-telecommunication area that has been covered, the three-fourth credit goes to what you call 'भाई साहब नहीं लगते', your BSNL, and hardly one-fourth goes to the other private providers, — and the difference is, it is 1500 with BSNL and that is 400 — putting together all private telecom companies, your Reliance, your TT Tele Services and so on and so forth. In this kind of a situation, when the Universal Service Obligation Fund is sought to bless the private telecom service providers for carrying it to rural area, — there is no problem — please do not forget that those who have already provided service without the blessings of your USOF, the BSNL, they must be treated, covered by this Fund retrospectively, from the date they are providing service there. The amendment moved by me in this Bill, and I insist on that amendment — practically pertains to this only. It says that they must be covered retrospectively. And, there is reason for apprehension. What is the present status of the USOF? The Universal Service Obligation Fund is constituted by taking a levy from all telephone service providers at the rate of five per cent on their adjusted gross revenue and, quite obviously, here again, in this Fund constitution, the BSNL is the biggest contributor. And, Sir, how that biggest contributor has been treated by this Universal Service Obligation Fund all these days? It is asked to provide landline services which is much costlier. As per the reply to an Unstarred Question No. 2282 in Lok Sabha on 15.12.2004, it has been stated that the operational loss, or you may say the net cost in terms of USOF terminology, incurred by the BSNL for providing telecom services in rural and remote areas in 2001-02, in 2002-03 and 2003-04 has been Rs. 24,342.84 crores — in three years, i.e., 2001-02, 2002-03 and 2003-04. And out of this, how has the Government fund assistance been flown to the BSNL, "भाई साहब नहीं लगते?" It is only Rs. 7620 crores, on account of licence fee reimbursement and some repayable loan. But from you USOF, it is a petty Rs. 520 crores. There was a reply given by the Minister in the Lok Sabha, saying it was Rs. 520 crores for these three

years. What about the subsequent years? Again, as per the reply given to another Question in the Lok Sabha on 17.05.2006, in the subsequent year, BSNL alone incurred an expenditure of Rs. 4527 crores in 2004-05 and 2005-06 for installing telecom services in rural and remote areas. The total disbursement from the USOF was around Rs. 3080 crores, despite the fact that your Fund was having a surplus of Rs. 7600 crores. Now, you have the Fund. You need to provide services in the rural and remote areas and the service is being provided by 'भाई साहब नहीं लगता' — BSNL. But वह लग जाता है। Despite there being a Fund, that assistance does not flow. Despite all this, BSNL had absorbed tremendous losses, and it is still providing a major part of telephone connectivity in the country. Please, don't demean it. Please, don't undermine it. And I insist, let us continue with the kind of performance the BSNL has as a public sector company. Many a people in this dirigisme regime always give a frowning look to a public sector unit. There are philosophical differences on it. But, on the ground, with the performance they have given, the manner in which they could till now provide communications, with all their limitations, to the remotest corner of the country, please, don't undermine them; please, don't humiliate them.

You have brought forward this Bill with the purpose of taking care of the technical difficulties in providing Government assistance, in spreading rural telecommunication. It is a very welcome step. But please, cover all those who have already played a role, retrospectively.

On the other hand, the contractual obligations of a licence, I think, is a matter that needs to be seriously probed. It also needs to be seen how well the different private telecom service providers are discharging the contractual obligations they have while going into loss-making, high-cost, low-income areas, and so on, and whether these obligations are being fulfilled by them; and if not, what action you would take. That also needs to be done. When you are providing an umbrella support to all concerned for providing a service, they also need to fulfil their obligations. Whether they are fulfilling those obligations or not, must be seen. So, there has to be a strong monitoring mechanism including penalty measures. On that aspect we have apprehensions because we have seen how — when the private service providers were introduced in the telecom sector, over a period, from the license fee regime to the revenue sharing regime — Government shifted its stand just to facilitate and favour the private providers

at the cost of the public exchequer and the public sector companies. That enmity is there and it would continue in the new regime too. But it must be seen logical, and that is why, I insist that this amendment, which has already been circulated, if accepted, may not do full justice. But it would, at least, partially ameliorate the discrimination being faced by BSNL. This is warranted in view of the responsibility they have already shouldered to reach telecom services to the remote rural areas, in the face of punishable default by private telecom companies in this regard despite their contractual obligations as per the conditions stipulated in the licence.

With these words, I would request and appeal to the hon. Minister to accept the amendment moved by me in this regard, to remain non-discriminatory and to uphold the propriety. Thank you.

SHRI P.G. NARAYANAN (Tamil Nadu): Mr. Deputy Chairman Sir, the principal Act provides for establishment of Universal Service Obligation Fund. The purpose of this Fund is to enable the Government to fulfil its universal service obligation, of providing basic telephone service, to every citizen, including people in the remote areas, at reasonable prices.

Sir, presently, the USO fund is available only for basic telephone services, that is, landline service. The Bill aims at enhancing the coverage and widening the scope of services under the USO fund. The Bill allows the extension of financial support from the USO fund to the cellular providers who are willing to extend cellular mobile services in rural and remote areas. Sir, while providing cellular services to remote areas, it should not be at the cost of landline services. The Government should not allow the fixed lines to suffer. Sir, it is necessary for rural India to take part in India's economic growth. Sir, the Government has to up-date the infrastructural facilities in rural areas so that rural areas can be developed at par with urban areas. Sir, to achieve the highest percentage of agriculture, production formats must be made available on internet connection to know about the up-date information and latest technology in the cultivation activities of various crops. Sir, for providing internet connection to rural areas, landline services are absolutely required. At present, the rent for the fixed lines is high. so, the rent has to be reduced to the minimum so that farmers and other weaker sections in the rural areas can afford to get the landline phones. So, while providing the USO fund for the cellular coverage, the Government has to encourage fixed lines telephony in rural areas. This is a vital requirement for the growth and equitable distributed. Thank you.

3.00 P.M.

श्री मंगनी लाल मंडल (बिहार): माननीय उपसभापति महोदय, माननीय सदस्यों ने इस विधेयक पर अपनी राय रखी है, मैं भी इसके समर्थन में खड़ा हुआ हूँ। यह ठीक है कि सूचना के क्षेत्र में, आईटी के क्षेत्र में बहुत बड़ी क्रांति हुई है, बहुत प्रगति हुई है, लेकिन ये सारी प्रगति और क्रांति केवल शहरों तक सिमट कर रह गई है।

माननीय मंत्री जी का वक्तव्य मेरे हाथ में है, इस वक्तव्य में जो कहा गया है, मैं उसे कोट करना चाहता हूँ, "भारत में दूरसंचार सैक्टर पिछले कुछ वर्षों में अभूतपूर्व प्रगति का साक्षी रहा है। मार्च, 2000 से जुलाई, 2006 तक सम्पूर्ण टेली-डेंसिटी 2.9 से बढ़ कर 14.10 हो गई है, तथापि शहरी टेली-डेंसिटी 8.2 से बढ़कर 44.05, अर्थात् पांच गुना बढ़ी है, जबकि ग्रामीण टेली-डेंसिटी 0.7 से बढ़ कर 1.86 ही हुई है।" जो सबसे ज्यादा चिंता की बात है और जो उन्होंने अपने वक्तव्य में आगे कही है, वह है, "प्रत्येक मास शहरी क्षेत्रों में लगभग 50,00,000 टेलीफोन जुड़ जाते हैं और शहरी तथा ग्रामीण टेली-डेंसिटी के बीच का अन्तर तेजी से बढ़ रहा है।" यह सरकार की स्वीकारोक्ति है, माननीय मंत्री जी ने अपनी वक्तव्य में स्वयं कहा है कि शहरी क्षेत्र और ग्रामीण क्षेत्र में यह अंतर बढ़ रहा है।

महोदय, सरकार का जो वक्तव्य है, उन्होंने जो संसद में दिया है, उसमें यह फिगर है जो अनकवर्ड विलेज हैं अभी तक जो एग्रीमेंट हुआ था, उसके आधार पर 66,882 गांव हैं जो आच्छादित विलेज नहीं हैं, यह उनका फिगर है और उसमें यह कहा गया है कि हमने कवर किया है सेटलाइट मीडिया से 14,183 अदर मीडिया से 52,639 और बीपीएल से 31.12.2005 तक 17,182 जो बेलेंस रह गए - रिमेनिंग विलेज वे हैं 49,640 अब यह स्थिति उन्होंने बताई है और जो बिल आया था उसमें कहा कि 1.7 प्रतिशत वृद्धि हुई है, अभी 1.86 प्रतिशत की बात की गई है। यह जो मंथर गति से, कछुए की चाल से प्रगति हो रही है और ग्रामीण इलाकों का, शहरों के बीच का जो अंतर बढ़ा रहा है, इसके बारे में निश्चित रूप से सरकार को कोई फैसला लेना होगा। यह जो विधेयक आया है बेसिक शब्द को, आधारी शब्द को हटाने के लिए और आधारी शब्द को हटाकर यह संशोधन विधेयक लाए हैं। अच्छी बात है हम सभी इसका समर्थन करते हैं, सभी माननीय सदस्यों ने इसका समर्थन किया है, लेकिन अभी यह जो स्थिति है, जो मैंने अभी गांव के बारे में बताया है, महोदय, उसमें अंडमान निकोबार का उल्लेख नहीं है, उसमें हरियाणा का बिहार का, कर्नाटक का, केरल का, पंजाब, तमिलनाडु, यू०पी० ईस्ट, यू०पी० वेस्ट और वेस्ट बंगाल का उल्लेख नहीं है। तब उन्होंने कहा कि 66,882 अनकवर्ड हैं, यह पार्लियामेंट में दिया गया है। इसलिए मैं चाहूंगा, मेरी जिज्ञासा है कि पूरी स्थिति क्या है, जो फिगर दिया गया है इसमें इतने प्रांतों के बारे में कोई गणना नहीं की गई है, कोई सूची नहीं बताई गई है कि विषय वस्तु क्या है, वस्तु-स्थिति क्या

है। महोदय, यह सरकार ने कहा है कि यह जो वेटिंग लिस्ट है, अब वेटिंग लिस्ट का निस्तारण नहीं होता है। अब ये सेलुलर से ग्रामीण इलाकों में नेटवर्क ले जाएंगे, और इसीलिए आधारी शब्द को हटा रहे हैं और डब्ल्यूएलएल जहां भी लगाया गया है वह काम नहीं करता है। स्थिति यह है कि हमारे जितने डब्ल्यूएलएल का अधिष्ठापन किया गया है, कहीं पर भी डब्ल्यूएलएल काम नहीं करता है। 31.12.2005 की फिगर है तथा इसमें और बढ़ोतरी हुई होगी। यह जो कम्बाईड वेटिंग लिस्ट है, लैंड लाइन और डब्ल्यूएलएल की वह 16,62,953 है। यह प्रतीक्षा सूची है। महोदय, हम लोग गांवों में जाते हैं, फील्ड में जाते हैं तो लोग यह शिकायत करते हैं कि चाहे मोबाइल का हो, चाहे डब्ल्यूएलएल का हो, चाहे लैंड लाइन का हो टेलीफोन दफ्तर में बहुत परेशान करते हैं। परेशानी के कई कारण हैं। लोगों के मन में संदेह है कि यह जो एयरटेल आ गया, यह जो रिलायंस आ गया, अभी यह जो दूसरे प्राइवेट सैक्टर के टेलीफोन वाले आ गए हैं, उनका और टेलीफोन विभाग के भीतर कोई अंतःसंबंध है, मैं ऐसा नहीं मानता हूं। लेकिन यह परसेप्शन है लोगों के बीच में और जो अवधारणा लोगों के बीच में बन गई है उस अवधारणा को समाप्त करना होगा, क्योंकि टेलीफोन डिपार्टमेंट में वेटिंग लिस्ट रहती है जो नीचे के अधिकारी हैं जिला स्तर तक के, वे उपभोक्ताओं की बात नहीं सुनते हैं और नतीजा यह है कि एयरटेल का नेटवर्क बढ़ रहा है, रिलायंस का नेटवर्क बढ़ रहा है, प्राइवेट सैक्टर का नेटवर्क बढ़ रहा है और आपका नेटवर्क नहीं बढ़ रहा है और जो वेटिंग लिस्ट है उसका निबटारा नहीं होता है। इसमें पब्लिक परसेप्शन है जिस पर सरकार को ध्यान देना होगा कि इसको कैसे मीट करें और वेटिंग लिस्ट कैसे खत्म करें।

महोदय, सेलुलर के मामले में यह वेटिंग लिस्ट कम नहीं है, यह 31.12.2005 तक की है, सरकार कहती है कि मोबाइल से हम देंगे, वायरलैस से हम देंगे। आधारी शब्द को, बेसिक शब्द को आप संशोधन के द्वारा हटाना चाहते हैं। मोबाइल की वेटिंग लिस्ट 14,05,096 है। यह सारे देश की है, कोई एक जगह की नहीं है, क्योंकि इसमें सारे प्रांतों की सूची है। महोदय, यह जो स्थिति है इसको समाप्त करना होगा। यद्यपि मंत्री जी नौजवान हैं, एनर्जेटिक हैं। वे संसद में अच्छा जवाब देते हैं, दोनों मंत्री नौजवान हैं। अगर दोनों मंत्री नौजवान हैं तो कछुए की चाल से आप क्यों चलते हैं? हाउस में जवाब तो आप बहुत फुर्तीला देते हैं, ऐसा लगता है कि सदन में ही क्रांति हो जाएगी। जवाब तो आपका बड़ा क्रांतिकारी होता है, लेकिन सदन के बाहर आपकी क्रांतिकारिता कछुए की चाल में बदल जाती है। इसको देखना होगा। यह न वहां का सवाल है, न यहां का सवाल है। हम सब जनता के प्रति कमिटिड हैं, प्रतिबद्ध हैं, इसलिए चाहे भारतीय जनता पार्टी के लोग हों या समाजवादी पार्टी के लोग हों या मार्क्सवादी कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी के लोग हों, उन लोगों ने जो राय व्यक्त की है या हमारे कांग्रेस पार्टी के साथियों ने जो राय व्यक्त की, सबकी यही आशंका है और सबकी यही जिज्ञासा है कि अभी तक जो प्राइवेट कम्पनियां हैं, वे घोड़े की गति से दौड़ रही हैं और आप कछुए की चाल से चल रहे हैं, तो दोनों का मुकाबला नहीं होगा। अधिनियम तो आप पारित कर लीजिएगा, कानून

बना लीजीएगा, फंड भी आपको अवेलेबल हो जाएगा, लेकिन कहीं न कहीं आपका जो मैनेजमेंट है, जो व्यवस्था है, जो प्रशासन है, उसको दुरुस्त करना होगा। आपने उसको दुरुस्त कर दिया, यह केवल कहने के लिए नहीं होना चाहिए, जनता को भी लगे कि घोड़े की चाल से हमारा बीएसएनएल, एमटीएनएल चल रहा है, तभी समझिएगा कि आपको यह सर्टिफिकेट मिलेगा। महोदय, हमारे बिहार से जो मंत्री हैं, राज्य मंत्री यहां नहीं हैं, लेकिन मैं बिहार की स्थिति भी यहां रखना चाहूंगा - देश के बारे में तो मैंने फिगरस दे दिए हैं - बिहार में 31.10.2005 तक 87,684 टेलीफोन कनेक्शंस की वेटिंग लिस्ट थी और 31.01.2006 तक यह वेटिंग लिस्ट बढ़कर 94,745 हो गयी। इस प्रकार से वेटिंग लिस्ट बढ़ी है, वह घट नहीं रही है, 7,100 के करीब बढ़ गयी। सरकार कहती है कि हम निपटारा करेंगे इसमें भी सरकार ने कहा है, जो दिया है, माननीय मंत्री का बयान है कि हम सबका निपटारा एक साल में कर देंगे। इसलिए मैं माननीय मंत्री जी से कहना चाहता हूं कि मैं इस बिल का समर्थन करता हूं, मैं आपकी प्रशंसा करता हूं, आपकी तेजस्विता की, प्रखरता की, लेकिन देश को इसका लाभ मिलना चाहिए। अंत में एक बात कहकर मैं अपनी बात समाप्त करना चाहता हूं कि बीएसएनएल मोबाइल सेवा जो है, यह ठीक है कि हमारे यहां जब भी बाढ़ आती है - अब तो दूसरे प्रदेशों में बाढ़ आयी है - तो टेलीफोन का कनेक्शन जहां नहीं है, गांव डूब जाता है, तब छत पर चढ़कर बाढ़ की क्या स्थिति है, लोग मोबाइल से बताते हैं कि इतने गांव यहां डूब गए, मवेशी डूब गए। आप जिला प्रशासन को कहीं संपर्क कीजिए। लेकिन जहां रिलायंस पहुंच गया है, एयरटेल पहुंच गया है - जब तक नहीं पहुंचा था - दो साल पहले हमारे बिहार में बाढ़ आयी थी - मोबाइल जहां पहुंचा वहां तो ठीक है, लेकिन जब एयरटेल पहुंच गया, रिलायंस पहुंच गया, गांव में लोग डूब रहे हैं, छत पर चढ़कर बीएसएनएल लगा रहे हैं तो अब सम्पर्क नहीं हो पाता है। जैसा इन्होंने अभी कहा कि कनेक्शन नहीं लगता है, तबाही मचती है, इसीलिए प्राइवेट कम्पनियों को आप प्रोत्साहित कर रहे हैं, यह अच्छी बात है, गांव तक पहुंचाएं, लेकिन प्राइवेट कम्पनियों से हमारी सेवा बेहतर हो, इसके लिए प्रयास करना चाहिए। अंत में मैं एक बात कहूंगा, मैं समझता हूं कि सबकी यह बात होगी। टेलीफोन एडवाइजरी कमेटी के लिए, निजी बात है(व्यवधान)....

श्री उदय प्रताप सिंह: एक बात अंत में कह दीजिए कि

जब तक कसी नहीं कमर, तभी तक कठिनाई है,
वरना ऐसा काम कौन जो किया न जाए।

श्री मंगनी लाल मंडल: ठीक है, मैं समर्थन करता हूं। मैं समझता हूं कि मंत्री जी नौजवान हैं, ज्ञानी हैं, वे इस बात को समझेंगे। महोदय, टेलीफोन एडवाइजरी कमेटी के लिए इन्होंने नाम मांगे थे। हम लोगों ने दे दिए, चार महीने पहले, तीन महीने पहले, दो महीने पहले। अभी तक सारी टेलीफोन एडवाइजरी कमेटी इनके कार्यालय में पेंडिंग पड़ी हुई है। हम यह कहना चाहेंगे कि इसको

आप निस्तारित कीजिए। छः-छः महीने से आपने रखा है। कौन सा हाकिम, कौन सा प्रशासक, कौन सा अफसर है जो इस पर कुंडली मारकर बैठ गया है? आप मंत्री हैं, आप इसको देखिए। दूसरा, मैं यह कहना चाहूंगा कि हमें जो पांच कोट मिला था, हमने दिया था, दो को लैंड लाइन था और तीन को डब्ल्यूएलएल था, जितने दिन टेलीफोन एडवाइजरी कमेटी में, वे लोग रहे, कभी डब्ल्यूएलएल ने फंक्शन नहीं किया और आपके अधिकारी इस बात को नहीं सुनते। इसीलिए मैं इस बिल का समर्थन करता हूँ और मैं समझता हूँ कि यह माननीय सदस्यों की बात है, इसलिए इस पर भी मंत्री जी अवश्य ध्यान देंगे। बहुत-बहुत धन्यवाद।

SHRIMATI N. P. DURGA (Andhra Pradesh): Sir, I thank you for allowing me to speak on this piece of legislation. Though I am not against the basic content of the proposed legislation *per se*, I have strong reservation about the way in which this has been brought before this House for its consideration. I oppose the Ordinance route through which the Government decided to bring this before this House. Sir, the Statement made by the hon. Minister explaining the reasons for promulgating an Ordinance is neither convincing nor justifiable nor satisfactory. We all know that the Indian Telegraph Bill was introduced on 19th May, 2006 and the same was referred to the Standing Committee on IT. In the meanwhile, on 30th October, 2006, an Ordinance was promulgated. The reason given is, "The Department of Telecommunication was of the opinion that the promulgation of an Ordinance would be necessary because waiting for process of the Bill, already before the Parliament, would delay the launching of the scheme by several months." It amuses me. The reason behind my amusement is that the Ordinance was promulgated on 30th October 2006, and the Winter Session of Parliament was commenced on 22nd November 2006. So, you have had hardly three weeks in between the promulgation of Ordinance and the commencement of the Session of Parliament. On what basis the Ministry has said that it would have delayed the entire process of utilising the Universal Services Obligation Fund by several months? What is the rationale behind it? I am sorry to say that the Minister has misled the House through his statement under Rule 66(2) of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Rajya Sabha by giving misinformation. Now, Sir, we have no other way but to pass this Bill. We all know that an Ordinance is a committed legislation. We are not in a position to make amendments because the Executive has already committed certain points through Ordinance, and they will have to be passed, as they are, without any substantive amendments.

Sir, no doubt, the objective of the Bill is laudable. The aim is to create sharable infrastructure in rural, remote, and inaccessible areas, and to support the telecom service providers to use this infrastructure for provision of mobile services. In continuation of this, I wish to know from the hon. Minister that there was a proposal earlier to develop passive infrastructure and the same can be used by the group of mobile service providers. What happened to that proposal?

Sir, the next point I wish to make is that the new Telecom Policy of 1999 envisaged achieving 'Telephone-on-Demand' in the rural areas by the year 2002. Now, we are in 2006. It is already seven years. Leave alone giving telephone-on-demand, the Department has failed to contain lakhs of landlines of the BSNL being surrendered by people, including people in the rural areas. How the Minister is sure of improving the rural teledensity after the passage of this Bill? I would also like to know how the Fund would be utilised and whether we will be able to achieve the target of 4 per cent by 2010 from the present teledensity of 1.86 as of July, 2006.

Sir, the other point I wish to make is about the amendmnet. The Bill proposed to delete the word 'basic' from the parent Act under Clause 1A of Section 3. There were extensive deliberations in the Standing Committee. Even the Department of Legal Affairs deposed before the Standing Committee on IT and gave its evidence. The Minister is saying that the Department of Legal Affairs is insisting on deleting the word 'basic' from Sub-Section 1A of Section 3 of the Act. But the Standing Committee, which deliberated extensively on this very word 'basic' has given its recommendation that there is no need to delete the word 'basic'. I had gone through the Act. Nowhere the word 'basic' has been defined either in the Act that is proposed to be amended or the Rules framed thereunder. Here the word 'basic' gives a generic meaning. Nowhere in the Act it has been defined that the word 'basic' means landline. The word is not giving any restrictive meaning as has been claimed by the Department of Legal Affairs. It was only since 1994-95 that we have started using the word 'basic' for landline and 'cellular' for mobile services. The USO Fund even otherwise has been extended to the Fixed and Wireless Telephony-limited mobile. I agree that it could not be used to cover the 'full mobile' services. But the WLL too works on the principle of wireless, though it serves only in a limited radius.

So, considering all this, the SC recommended in its 34th Report that there is no need to delete the word 'basic' from the Act. Now, how the Department of Legal Affairs has recommended deleting this word? So, I would like to know from the hon. Minister what was the view expressed by the Department of Legal Affairs while making its presentation before the Committee. Whether there is any contradiction between the two-its submission before the Standing Committee and the recommendation given to the Ministry. If yes, the details and reasons may be explained.

It is good that with the help of USO Fund, the Government is trying to achieve the teledensity. But, I wish to know how the Government is planning to set up twenty thousand base stations in rural areas to cover all the villages. Whether any assistance would be given from the USO Fund to telephone companies, or, are they going to utilize the passive infrastructure? I would like to know about this from the hon. Minister.

Finally, Sir, I would only say that there is a need to re-look at the traditional policies and a time has come that our policies of providing telecom to villages are looked as a Universal Service Opportunity rather than a Universal Service Obligation. Thank you, Sir.

SHRI R. SHUNMUGASUNDARAM (Tamil Nadu): Thank you, Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir. I welcome this Bill and I congratulate the hon. Minister for bringing this amendment. Sir, the inability in using the Universal Service Obligation Fund for the landline telephones and the wireless fixed line telephones was the reason for bringing this particular amendment. The urgency is understandable because there should not be even a single day's loss for providing or extending the facilities to the rural areas and the remote villages in this country.

Sir, we have seen a phenomenal growth in this particular sector. Sir, now, it is understood that about 180 million mobile phone users, including about 100 million GSM users are in this country. India is now reported to be the third largest in the world in usage of cellular phones after, of course, China and Russia. China is reported to have about 400 million and Russia is reported to have 252 million and now, India has reached 100-million mark in GSM. Of course, population-wise, the difference between India and China is not that much, but the usage of cellular phone wise, they are four times ahead of us. Therefore, the concentration, as advised, should be on the rural sector and it should be extended to villages and that is what is being done.

Sir, a recent press report, of course, by one of the officials of the Department says that there is a phenomenal growth in the C-circle area, particularly Bihar and Assam have reported growth in usage of cellular phones and GSM phones. Sir, we have seen growth in this sector only recently. Of course, about three years back, there were Village Public Telephones, VPTs. There was 100 per cent VPTs in Tamil Nadu. Some States have achieved 100 per cent mark in the Village Public Telephones, but certain other States could not achieve 100 per cent mark in VPTs. Sir, after the UPA Government took office, we have seen a phenomenal growth both in the landline and the cellular phones. It is because of the one-rupee scheme as announced by the hon. Minister. Sir, now, people from Kanyakumari can call their relatives somewhere in North for just Re. 1. This has really contributed to the growth of the industry. Sir, there is a saying that the proof of the pudding is in the eating. Sir, in the recent elections to the Tamil Nadu Assembly, when the hon. Minister was touring, I had an occasion to accompany him for a day. And I saw the response to the hon. Minister. That was the response from the people to the one-rupee scheme. I am happy that I had requested him to make a separate tour after assessing his popularity. I now request the hon. Minister to go a step forward and make an announcement for bringing in the third-generation facilities in this country. Bring in car phones and CDMA phones in the public transport like trains, metro trains etc.

Sir, I have come across a problem with the cellular phones, and that is, in installing towers. In villages, and even in certain cities, the local bodies and the Municipal Corporations are taxing these towers. In certain areas, these towers are taxed under 'house tax'. They are considered as 'buildings' and are taxed under 'house tax'. Sir, this is levied apart from the licence fee, whatever it is, that the cellular companies are paying. And this house tax charged by the local bodies will definitely deter the cellular companies from expanding and establishing more and more towers. So, this is an area on which the Minister should also concentrate. He should request all the local bodies and the Municipal Corporations not to separately tax these towers.

Sir, with these words, I welcome this Bill and thank the hon. Minister.

SHRI B.J. PANDA (Orissa): Sir, I support this Bill, but with some unease and a plenty of concerns, which I will take up.

Sir, the basic purpose for a Universal Service Obligation Fund is to provide incentives to telecom operators to set up operations in those areas which are not lucrative enough. It is as simple as that. But you have heard, Sir, all my colleagues mentioning repeatedly, many of them, about how the telecom growth that has happened in India is lopsided. We have got far more benefits and far more growth in urban areas, and commensurately much less in rural areas. And that was the fundamental purpose of the USO Fund, to provide that encouragement, that incentive, to make otherwise border line operations financially viable, and, there, we have not done so well. But I do not want to just criticise the hon. Minister because some good things have happened, and I would like to take a balanced approach and point those out.

Sir, you have heard about the tele-density figures which so many of my colleagues have talked about. But let me quote some other statistics. If the fundamental purpose of the USO Fund is to provide funding to companies, both PSUs and private sector, to build networks in rural areas, what is the result of that? Today, we are talking about building mobile networks in rural areas with this encouragement. But the original purpose of the USO Fund was to actually build fixed line telephones, landline telephones. I will come to the rationale for that, but let us first take a look at the landline telephone situation today. All these private sector companies which have come in have barely made a drop-in-the-ocean investment in landline. The landline investment has been left to the PSUs, particularly the BSNL, which has been making landline investment. And, here, Sir, let me quote you the statistics. These are from the BSNL's own website, their own capital expenditure for networks. The trend for the last six-seven years, let me read out here. In 2000-01, it was almost Rs. 16,000 crores; in 2001-02, it went up to Rs. 17,000 crores; in 2002-03 Rs. 12,000 crores; in 2003-04 Rs. 6,500 crores; in 2004-05 Rs. 7,500 crores, and in 2005-06 Rs. 6,800 crores. It has come down to one-third of what it was spending. Now, the USO Fund which has been collected should have gone towards not just BSNL but anybody who was willing to build networks in rural areas, and, primarily, fixed line networks. Only today, we are considering enabling the Fund to go to mobile networks. But in respect of fixed line networks, as you can see, the investment level has kept dropping. And we should not criticise the BSNL because BSNL at least has been investing. The private sector players have not invested. Therefore, there is not that

competition in the fixed line sphere which you today have in the mobile sphere. It has caused the mobile rates to drop dramatically. Consequently, the rates of land line telephone usage have not come down because there is no competition as the private sector players have not invested in it. The USO Fund should have provided more money to encourage the BSNL to spend more, and it should have also encouraged the private players to, at least, get their feet into this business to make it attractive. If you look at the USO Fund itself, here are the figures. In the last five years—these are the approximate figures which I have taken from the Ministry's own website—the total collection of the USO Fund is approximately Rs. 13,000 crores. This includes the estimated fund collected for this year, 2006-07. The total allocation, including the estimated allocation for this year, is only about Rs. 5,000 crores. So, a little more than one-third of what has been collected has actually been spent. But, as I have said earlier, I will take a balanced approach. I will not just criticise for the sake of criticising. There is some good news and the good news is that until the year 2005-06, going back to the previous four years, whatever has been allocated has been fully utilised, according to the website of the Ministry, and I compliment the Minister for that. What I would urge you to do is that there are large funds which are still waiting to be allocated, you should expedite. I support the idea that we should now encourage this Fund even to go into the mobile networks for the rural areas. But that should not be the sole objective. Let me point out why it should not be our sole objective. Some Members, some of my colleagues, have pointed out that the TRAI has not supported this move to provide USO funding for mobile. That is not correct. The TRAI has supported it. We must, in that case, consider that it has been done on the basis of assessing the pros and cons and, therefore, I also support it. But all the TRAI recommendations are not being implemented by the Government. For example, the TRAI has made a lot of recommendations to encourage fixed line investments which are gathering dust in the Ministry. I want the hon. Minister to take up this matter in his reply as to why fixed line investments are not being encouraged. Why should we invest in fixed line? There may be a thinking that mobile is the wave of the future and why not just encourage mobile only. As I said, I am not against encouraging mobile. But the fundamental purpose of the Fund was to encourage fixed line and that should not be discarded. There are very good reasons why it should not be discarded. If we put all our investments and all the encouragement for investment into one basket, it is like putting all the

eggs into one basket. Let us not fool ourselves that only mobile will prevail in the future. For many decades to come, there are very significant benefits to come from landline networks where investments are not being made in our country for the last so many years. We need to encourage that investment. Let me point out and let me bring to the Minister's attention, if you look at the investment patterns of the developing countries like the US, Europe and Japan, you will find that there has been a resurgence in the investment in fixed line networks. New network technologies, which are very fibre rich, which include a lot of optical fibre in the network, are today getting billions of dollars worth of investment. Very soon we are going to see that we are lagging far behind the other countries because our fixed line networks are not simply getting investment. Once again, I repeat that I totally support the idea that we must encourage all forms of investment, particularly, in the rural areas. Mobile has become cheaper today and our common Indian can afford a mobile. So, we must encourage mobile. But by not investing enough, by not investing adequately in fixed line network, we are missing out and, as I just pointed out, there is a large technology gap between India and other developing countries. I will cite one example, which, I am sure, the Minister will be able to appreciate. One example is broadband. India today is far behind the rest of the world in implementing broadband. Let us not fool ourselves that broadband is only for the urban; that broadband is only for the rich. Broadband is precisely for the rural areas and it is precisely for the poor. In the home State of the Minister, Chennai is a very well developed IT centre. Elsewhere, Bangaluru is a very well developed IT centre. But we have the skills and the human resources, and the rural areas of Orissa or West Bengal or Bihar or Jharkhand can also get a peice of the IT industry, provided they have world-class telecom service. This world-class telecom service will come primarily from fixed line. Why? Wireless can be cheap voice telephony. It can also give us internet access. But true industrial strength broadband, which any BPO requires, which any back-end IT set-up requires, which any four or five graduate students can get together and start developing software and to be connected with the rest of the world, comes from fixed lines and that should be provided.

Today and for many years into the future, very high capacity and high-speed broadband access can be provided only by wire line networks for a long time. We must thus encourage wire line. But that is not happening

adequately. There is also a reason to believe that there is step-motherly treatment towards encouraging investment in fixed line networks. First of all, the kind of incentives that are being provided today for mobile investment is simply not matched by the kind of incentives that are provided for fixed line investments. There are many regulatory barriers today which make it not attractive enough for anybody to go into the fixed line network investment particularly in the rural areas. My hon. colleague was just talking about the proof of the pudding. The proof of the pudding is that there is hardly any fixed line investment. Whatever little there is, it is only from the BSNL. Where is the fixed line investment from the Reliance, Bharati, Hutch and all the others? Now you can argue that they are only interested in profit and that is why they are not investing in these high cost networks particularly in rural areas. That is precisely why we have the USO Fund. The precise purpose of the USO Fund is, where there is not enough profit for these people to go in, we have a tender process whoever bids for the lowest amount of subsidy to make his project viable, picks up the fund and goes there. You are planning to do the same for the mobile allocation of the USO Fund. Some of your colleagues and other Ministries like the Ministry of Civil Aviation are now planning to do exactly the same, to have tenders for the non-profitable routes which some of these airlines will take up by bidding for what is the lowest amount of subsidy that they will take. Why can't we have the same for the fixed line? As I said, the proof of the pudding is, there is not enough investment in fixed line networks, particularly in rural areas. We must correct that imbalance. I will support his Bill, but I strongly urge the Minister to do some introspection, to do some re-jigging of the regulations in force so that fixed line networks become more viable, more attractive to all the operators including the BSNL which has done a Yeoman's service in the past, but has been dropping for the last five years. As I said, none of the private operators have made any significant investment yet.

My point is, we are today talking about an amendment to the Act which has been in place since 1885. I think that reflects our mindset of making incremental changes. The hon. Minister is probably the youngest Minister who has ever held this portfolio. He is a man of the 21st Century. Time has come to do away with these two centuries old legislation and to come up with a comprehensive Bill which is suitable for the 21st Century telecom environment. We have done this in electricity. In energy, starting in the

early 90s, we had many little incremental changes, until three years ago we had finally a comprehensive Bill which in 2003 replaced the Electricity Act of 1910, replaced the Electricity Act of 1948 and replaced all the other little changes that we had made in-between. It is high time that you come up with comprehensive Telecom Act which takes into account the current reality, replaces all the existing laws and is suitable for today's environment.

Sir, I will conclude with only one comment. The Minister has done some good work. As I said, he has stepped up the utilisation of whatever funds have been allocated. But here I would like to take this opportunity, as the hon. Finance Minister is sitting here, to point out something. It has been stated in public by officials of the Telecom Ministry that the reason that the USO Funds have not been given in proportion to what is available, is due to the Finance Ministry. They have made a point that the collection of the USO Fund goes into the Consolidated Fund and it does not get released fast enough. That is a matter between your two Ministries to sort out. I will urge you to please sit together and find ways to disburse this fund faster. I think, equally the responsibility lies with the Telecom Ministry. I would like to know as to how many pending applications are there for the USO Fund. It is one thing to say that because it goes into the Consolidated Fund, it does not get released fast enough. The other question is, beside the BSNL, how many pending applications are there from all the operators seeking USO Fund? That is the core responsibility of the Telecom Ministry to encourage those applications and to facilitate those funds released so that these investments can take place.

While concluding, I would just like to point out that the hon. Minister should remember that he is not the Minister for Mobile Telephony in the country. He is the Minister for all telecom services. It is a great thing that mobile telephony is doing such a great job in this country. We must encourage it. But let us not forget the core purpose for which our USO fund was set up. And I look forward to a revised policy, revised implementation, which will make possible much faster investments in Fixed Line networks, particularly in rural areas.

SHRI SYED AZEEZ PASHA (Andhra Pradesh): Hon. Deputy Chairman, Sir, while endorsing the viewpoint expressed by my Left friend, Shri Tapan Kumar Sen, I want to point out certain issues in regard to Fixed Line Cellular Services. Even though we were having a declared policy that by

the year 2002, we would take the telecommunication facility to every nook and corner of the country, to the remote areas and the rural areas of our country, but, unfortunately, we are yet to reach the target. That is why I join other Members in saying that this is the most important task which we have to undertake. And as regards the private companies which have terribly failed to fulfil their contractual obligation of taking this network to the vast rural areas, I think, some serious view has to be taken and we have to find out why they have failed, even though we were having the USO Fund, which is nothing but a great incentive for them, to cover the uncovered areas. Unfortunately, what we are seeing is that more than 49,640 villages are yet to be covered by telecommunication lines. While appreciating the good work done by the BSNL for taking it to vast rural areas, there are certain, flaws which I want to point out. There is a big queue and a long waiting list because people, who aspire to get the BSNL connection, are being told that there is shortage of SIM cards and hence they will not be able to meet their demand. I want to ask one thing: When the private companies are able to procure SIM cards and there is no shortage, why is it that the BSNL is facing this shortage, that too, an acute shortage? They may say that the demand is more with the BSNL, and that is why, they are not in a position to fulfil the demand. But these private companies, in spite of having a huge demand, are able to fulfil their targets. So, on this, I think, the hon. Minister should give a serious thought in fulfilling this gap and not to have any sort of waiting lists before them. Then, while talking about the fixed lines which will have to be provided to the rural areas, we are saying that there is no waiting list at all, and the demand in urban areas is very much going down. When this is so, why can't we transfer this fund to the rural areas so that this fund is utilised there?

Sir, my learned friend, Mr. Naik, has already pointed out that even though we have been provided with a good BSNL apparatus, the GPRS connection is yet to be given. Every time I go and ask them about it, they tell me that I would be given the GPRS connection within a fortnight or so. But this is yet to be done. If we get this connection, then it will really help in our work and functioning. Thank you very much.

SHRI DAYANIDHI MARAN: Sir, in the first instance, I thank the hon. members who have supported the Bill and also those who have given their valuable opinion on this Government Bill.

Sir, the main reason for the department to bring the Bill was this. At the time when this scheme was envisaged, it was pointed out that the definition of the Universal Service Obligation in Clause 1A, Section 3, of the Indian Telegraph Act, 1885 included the word 'basic'. Though the word 'basic' is not defined in the Act ...(*Interruptions*) usage of the word 'basic' refers to wireline and fixed wireless terminals. It was felt that because of the connotation of the word 'basic', it would not be possible to support mobile infrastructure activities from the Universal Service Obligation Fund. The Department of Legal Affairs opined that it was necessary to delete the word 'basic' by a suitable amendment. The Department of Telecom also supported this view. We felt that it was better to safeguard ourselves from any future litigation.

Some Members did raise the question as to why this Ordinance was brought in. Sir, the Monsoon Session of Parliament ended on 25th August, 2006. Preparatory work for the scheme to support the infrastructure for cellular services in rural and remote areas was at an advance stage. The passage of the Bill which had been introduced in the Parliament was awaited. The scheme would have been pushed back by several months. The delay in launching the scheme would have affected the provisions of not only the voice telephony, but also the effort to keep extended broadband connectivity in rural and remote areas. Keeping in view the strong sentiments expressed by the Standing Committee, the Consultative Committee and the debates in the Parliament on the urgent need to provide telecom services in rural areas, it was felt that the promulgation of an Ordinance would help in the early launch of the scheme. After the issue of the Ordinance a draft tender had already been placed on the website of the Department of Telecommunication and notice inviting the tender would be issued by the third week of December. After this, the rules for the administration of the Fund under the Indian Telegraph Act, Rules 2006 have been published on 17th November, 2006. A draft tender document for setting up and managing the infrastructure sites and provision of mobiles within specific rural and remote areas of the country has been placed on the DoT website on 21.11.2006 for inviting comments and suggestions of the stakeholders.

Sir, many hon. Members here raised a lot of question and also made a lot of suggestions. In fact, Sir, Shri B.J. Panda had raised very good points. He said that the USOF was not being diverted for wireless. Sir, India is a developing country and we are a country of paradox. All the hon. Members

are asking us why we are not investing in fixed lines. I would like to quote the number of landline connections being surrendered every month, every year. From the States from which Shri Panda comes, in Orissa, in 2003, 64,924 landlines were surrendered. In 2004-05, 36,137 landlines were surrendered. In 2005-06, 47,513 landlines were surrendered. In this year, up to now 40,000 landlines have been surrendered. The fact is that today, in mobile phones, there is a boom. We should choose a technology that people want. It is not what we want. Today, if people want mobile phones, we should provide them mobile phones. Sir, when the mobile phone was introduced in 1994-95, it was for the rich, it was for the elite. A call per minute cost Rs. 16.80. It was not one-way. If I had called you, you would also have paid. Today, because of the telecom revolution and also because of the policies of the Government, you can call at a charge of, as low as, one rupee and there is no charge for incoming calls. Incoming is absolutely free to the subscriber. Sir, people are saying that we should encourage landlines. The consumers want wireless. Today, a rickshawala wants to have a wireless. It is convenient for him. Take a middle-class family. The husband has a mobile phone. The wife has a mobile phone. They find it difficult to have a landline because it does not make sense monetarily to pay three rentals. With this situation, when consumers want mobile phones, we have to provide them mobile phones.

SHRI B. J. PANDA: Will you please yield for half-a-minute? There is no competition in landlines.

SHRI DAYANIDHI MARAN: Let me complete. Sir, many Members raised a point. They were a little confused about what the Universal Service Obligation Fund is and the way we are using it. The Universal Service Obligation Fund is collected from out of the license fees of all the operators, not only of the BSNL. It is collected from the operators. Five per cent, that is at least 50 per cent of the license fee, is taken from the license fees collected from all the operators and this money is being used for the Universal Service Obligation Fund.

Sir, till now, the BSNL has been the beneficiary of it. It has been using 98 per cent of the USO funds. Till now, 98 per cent of the USO funds are being used by the BSNL alone. Sir, we also want the private operators to come in. Sir, the technology is changing. Sir, today, the hon. Members asked me as to why we are not giving new landlines. One landline connection

costs Rs. 30,000. It is not viable for any competition. Sir, today, the BSNL has to behave like a private entity. It is much more faster and easier to give a WLL connection or a CDMA connection or a mobile connection. Sir, today, this House is talking differently. But, the world is looking at India totally differently. Sir, in January, I had the occasion to meet the Prime Minister of Finland. He had come here to inaugurate a Nokia factory. He asked me, 'Mr. Maran, how are your mobile connections doing?' I joked to him and said, 'Sir, we are adding the population of Finland this month to the number of new users to India.' It is five million, Sir. When the UPA Government took over, we were adding 1.75 million subscribers. Sir, last month, it was 6.8 million. We are touching the seven million mark. Sir, when the UPA Government took over, we had only 75 million connections, both inclusive of mobile and landline. Sir, today, we have 180 million users; both mobile and landline. Sir, the GSM alone has crossed 100 million. We have now elevated ourselves to the top three countries using the phone lines. There is China; then Russia and now India, Sir. We are having amazing growth in this technology. Sir, today, the cost of a GSM or wireless line is just Rs. 3,000 plus. It is so economical for the telecom companies to provide GSM connections or CDMA connections to their subscribers. Simultaneously, Sir, Members were saying that the private operators are doing much better in mobile, and the BSNL and MTNL are going slow. Sir, this is a mistake and misleading. I feel the hon. Members are mistaking the way the BSNL is operating. Sir, the private operators came into the operation of wireless service and GSM service way back in 1994, 1995 and 1996. Do you know when did the BSNL start this service? It started only in 2002. Sir, till now, the BSNL has added 22 million mobile connections. Do you know how much we have added in the last two-and-a-half years? Sir, 16 million new users have been added by the BSNL in just the last two-and-a-half years. So, you can see the way we are doing it. We are number two, compared to the other operators who had started much earlier. Sir, the BSNL is doing a yeoman service. Sir, it is a constant progress. Why are we asking for the USO funds? Sir, we are not asking for the USO funds to put up towers in Delhi, Mumbai, Kolkata, Chennai or Bangalore. We are amending this Bill so that the USO fund can be used to put towers in remote areas where no towers exist. There is no telecom service provider in those areas, not even the BSNL or anyone which is providing telecom service in those areas. We want to use these funds for those areas. Sir, we are enjoying the benefit of technology; we are able to

carry a mobile phone in our pockets and walk around. Sir, our people who are living in rural areas are not even eligible for this. Sir, it is not possible. Sir, by providing these 8000 towers in about 27 States, we will be able to provide telecom service fast in the rural areas. Sir, we feel that by bringing this Bill, we will try to cover areas, villages which have population of more than 2000. Sir, whichever villages are eligible, which have a population of more than 2000 will be covered in this scheme. Our idea is to provide 80 per cent coverage of wireless line by 2007. It is our plan, Sir. For the first time, the Department of Telecom has put up a target. Sir, when the UPA Government came to power in 2004, we said that we will have 250 million users by the year 2007. Today, we have reached at 180 million. In the next one year, I am very confident that we will overshoot our 215 million mark. Sir, we have been aggressive now. We have also put up a target to reach 500 million by 2010. Today, mobile is the fastest way of reaching the consumer.

Sir, we have reduced the national long-distance charges. Today, in one rupee you can make a call from Kashmir to Kanyakumari. Today, the people are very happy with this. With all these things, they are happy. But, the picture is not good. The urban areas are benefited. In the cities, we have a teledensity of more than 40 per cent to 55 per cent. But in the rural areas we do not have. That is precisely why we are bringing this amendment and precisely because the divide between the rural and urban areas is so much and we have to take mobile service revolution to our villages. That is the reason that we are asking now for an amendment so that we can use the USO fund to provide mobile towers. Again, Sir, May I ask whether it is going to be BSNL. No, Sir. It depends because we are not for one person; it is not for BSNL or Tatas, or Reliance or Bharti. It is going to be a bid process and whoever needs subsidy for a passive infrastructure. The hon. Member has asked, it is exactly the same scheme to provide passive infrastructure support for five years so that any area which is not viable they are putting the sweet, they are putting the carrot so that these service providers can go and whoever wants. And that is not for one. Each tower can support three service providers so that there is competition; there will be competitive rates, competitive rentals which will come to our people, our citizens in the villages. This precisely is the reason why we are doing it. Sir, many Members asked various questions. Sir, I am sure that with your support if they want two phones or three

[13 December, 2006]

RAJYA SABHA

phones, we are ready to provide. As long as the Parliament is interested, we have no objection. ...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: They are only asking for two chips.

SHRI DAYANIDHI MARAN: I think it is up to the Parliament to decide what to do. ...*(Interruptions)*... We are only service providers. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI VIRENDRA BHATIA: Roaming should be charged at local rates. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI DAYANIDHI MARAN: Again the hon. Members are confused. It is not MTNL or BSNL; it is the Parliament orders. ...*(Interruptions)*... It is the Parliament's decision, which we implement. We are not the choosers ...*(Interruptions)*... Whatever Parliament orders, we implement. ...*(Interruptions)*... Some hon. Members wanted that we should give fax. It is all possible in any network, including the BSNL and MTNL. But you have to change your equipment. If the equipment you buy has got facility, then it is possible for you to receive fax. All of us are using the standard science and technology, Sir. The BSNL and MTNL are on the top of technology and we are not compromising any of the technologies. Sir, as per the amendment requested by our hon. Member, Tapan Sen, Sir, we feel that the aim and purpose of the present scheme is to provide shared infrastructure for providing mobile service in the rural and remote areas. Sharing will reduce the capital expenditure and provide competition, which has implication of affordability. The services, which are already being provided in the rural and remote areas, are very often being provided by the service providers in the individual capacity. The infrastructure set up by them may not be adequate whenever shared by two other service providers. Further, some service providers had gone into selected rural areas and after careful consideration of economic viability of providing service to those areas, under the scheme now proposed, those remote and backward areas are being identified where there is existing fixed wireless or mobile coverage. Moreover, they are such backward areas where without incentive the telecom service providers may not go. So, we are not able to accept this proposal of amendment, Sir. And for the first time, Sir, hon. Member, Mr. Panda has requested about broadband. In this new scheme, which we have proposed, Sir, we are trying to bring broadband to the rural areas also. We are proposing to provide broadband to all the schools in this

scheme so that we can take broadband service there. In fact, the BSNL has come supportive, Sir. The BSNL has announced the year 2007 as the year of broadband. We realise, Sir, we have to promote broadband. Sir, the hon. Members have raised several issues. Sir, we announced our broadband policy only in January 2005 and in two years, Sir, we have crossed 1.5 million broadband users. The BSNL is coming out with much more services in the coming year. We should also understand that broadband service does not depend on broadband alone. We need computers also. The computer penetration is only 4.5 million to 5 million a year. We also have to work on the content side, Sir, which will be part of the IT which we are doing. Sir, the Members asked various things and we are trying to do as much as possible. In no area, nowhere, the BSNL has tried to compromise its service. But we do understand, Sir, that we are constantly growing. Sir, today the BSNL and Indian telecom sector, with all the numbers if we add, we have just got 15 per cent teledensity. That means, Sir, a lot of road is still to be covered and we have to cover more districts and more people have to use phone. We feel, Sir, that this is a process trying to get more towers and more consumers to use. We feel that we are on the right track. Again, Sir, the technology — whether it is going to be GSM or CDMA or WLL or fixed line, it depends on the company which wins the tender for the *lower support* and whatever it decides it is best for a particular location, Sir. With this, Sir, I request that the Bill may be passed.

SHRI TAPAN KUMAR SEN: Sir, I accept what the hon. Minister has said about the purpose. It is a very laudable purpose. Mobile services have to be taken to the remote areas and to villages and for that purpose financial support is to be given.

Sir, my amendment only pertains to those agencies that have already provided the mobile services in the rural and remote areas as defined by the Government of India *i.e.*, the Ministry of Telecommunications. My point is they should be covered retrospectively with the 'blessings' of this Fund. Why should there be any difficulty when this amendment does not contravene the purpose of the whole exercise? It does not contravene any of the objectives of the Bill. So, why you don't want to do it? Otherwise, shall I apprehend that after this, the whole thing will go to mobile services and the landline services would be neglected? So, I request, again, the hon. Minister to kindly consider the amendment, since there should not be any difficulty on the part of the Government to accept this amendment

which says that you extend this scheme to those who have already providing the mobile services. Thank you.

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY : Sir, I am proud of the hon. Minister.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Are you seeking clarification?

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: Yes, Sir. He is inviting a lot of multinational companies and they are coming and investing in India to manufacture mobile phones. Of course, most of them are going to Tamil Nadu. It is a different thing.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Should they also come to Puducherry?

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: Sir, I am coming to that subject only. I say that some of the industries should also come to Puducherry.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Okay.

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: Sir, I have not come to the subject so far.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Discussion on this Bill is over. Don't come to the subject again.

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: Sir, it is a very important thing. The hon. Minister will answer. Why can't the Telecom Ministry itself develop a technology and put up mobile manufacturing industries of its own? Why can't the Ministry do it? Allowing multinational companies is all right. Why can't the Ministry set up units on its own so that the public sector will also grow? This is what I want to know from the hon. Minister. Thank you.

श्री विजय कुमार रूपाणी (गुजरात): महोदय, आपके माध्यम से मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि यह ब्रॉड बैंड इंटरनेट सिस्टम, जो बीएसएनएल ने अभी शुरू किया है, क्या सरकार उस सिस्टम को वायरलेस करना चाहती है। जिस तरह रिलायंस ने चिप दी है और उसे वायरलेस करने जा रहे हैं, लेकिन वह "लो-बैंड" है। मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या ब्रॉड बैंड के अंदर भी हम वायरलेस सिस्टम की फ्रीक्वेंसी दे रहे हैं या नहीं।

श्री सुरेश भारद्वाज: माननीय मंत्री जी ने इसकी ...(व्यवधान)

श्री उपसभापति: विस्तार से क्लैरिफिकेशन दी है।

4.00 P.M.

श्री सुरेश भारद्वाज: सर, मैं क्लैरिफिकेशन ही पूछ रहा हूँ।

यूएसओ फंड का इन्फ्रास्ट्रक्चर रूरल एरियाज़ में बनाने के लिए वर्ष 2002 में इसका निर्माण किया गया था, अब इसमें से बेसिक शब्द हटाकर आप मोबाइल सर्विसेज़ को भी ऐड करना चाहते हैं।

हिन्दुस्तान में ऐसे बहुत सारे प्रदेश हैं, जहां पर वायरलैस सिस्टम काम नहीं करता है, जैसे हिली एरियाज़ हैं जहां पर आप एक जगह टावर लगाते हैं, जिसके कारण कुछ स्थानों पर तो मोबाइल और वायरलैस सर्विस काम करती है, लेकिन बाकी स्थानों पर वह काम नहीं करती है। ऐसे स्थानों पर जो बेसिक टेलीफोन सिस्टम हैं, जो वायर से लगता है, वही काम करता है।

मैं माननीय मंत्री जी से यह जानना चाहूंगा कि क्या इस यूएसओ फंड को ऐसे हिली एरियाज़ में, पर्वतीय प्रदेशों में बीएसएनएल या दूसरी सर्विसेज़ को दिया जाएगा ताकि वहां पर जो बेसिक टेलीफोन सर्विसेज़ हैं, वे रिमोट से रिमोट एरियाज़ में भी एक्सेलेबल हो सकें।

SHRI C. PERUMAL (Tamil Nadu): Sir, the hon Minister is proud of BSNL. But, for a single connection, we have to try 100 times or 200 times. In spite of that, we are not able to get it. There is a standard reply that there is error in connection. I would like to know what new technology the Ministry is developing in this regard. Thank you.

SHRI DAYANIDHI MARAN: Sir, as the hon. Member, Shri Tapan Sengupta, has mentioned, those who had already gone there and set up network, are not sharing it. They have been using it as single operator. But our scheme is to make sure that whatever infrastructure is put has to be shared. We are very clear that new infrastructure will come in areas where no infrastructure has been set up by any operator. That is the salient feature of this new scheme. It is definitely very clear that wireless service, wireless internet, wireless technology seems to be the future. The Wi-max is already coming into the Wi-fi. The Wi-max seems to be the most disruptive technology which India had to accept. We are proud to say that India has taken a lead in the Wi-max research. The C-Dot and the Alcatel Research, Chennai, are coming with their own consumer premises equipments from the middle of the next year, which will be our own technology, research done from our side.

So far as the point raised by hon. Member, Shri V. Narayanasamy is concerned, it is a fact that we have set up a growth target of 250 million.

And, we will achieve it. We had, for the first time, set a target for growth and capital. For the first time, the BSNL and the MTNL said that the equipments are to be made in India. That's why you see that the Nokia, the Motorola and other companies have come up and set up their facilities, because of our growth. We have capitalised on the growth and we are going to make it sure that we do not import any equipment from outside, rather these equipments are made in our own country.

Sir, I would also like to make a point that several Members have attributed the credit of telecom to different leaders. But, I think, the country should not forget that it was Late Shri Rajiv Gandhi who brought the telecom revolution in India. It was because of his visionary power that we saw in the mid-eighties the STD booths in every village, offering service to every citizen of the country. He started this revolution. Now, we are trying to bring revolution in mobile phones. So, let us not forget that the credit should go to Late Shri Rajiv Gandhi. I thought that I should mention that. That's all, Sir.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

That the Bill further to amend the Indian Telegraph Act, 1885, as passed by Lok Sabha, be taken into consideration.

The motion was adopted.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We shall now take up the clause-by-clause consideration of the Bill.

Clause 2 was added to the Bill.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: There is one amendment for insertion of clause 2(a) by Shri Tapan Kumar Sen. Mr. Sen, are you moving your amendment?

NEW CLAUSE - 2A

SHRI TAPAN KUMAR SEN (West Bengal): Sir, I move:

1. That at page 1, after line 7, the following new clause be inserted, namely:—

"2A. In Section 9D of the principal Act, after sub-section (3), the following new sub-section shall be inserted, namely:—

"(4) On and from the commencement of the Indian Telegraph (Amendment) Act, 2006, the mobile/cellular services already provided in rural and remote areas shall come under the coverage of this Fund with retrospective effect from the actual date of providing mobile/cellular services and the concerned service providers shall be extended financial support from this Fund for the services, provided."

The question was put and the motion was negatived.

Clause 3 was added to the Bill.

Caluse 1, the Enacting Formula and the Title were added to the Bill.

SHRI DAYANIDHI MARAN: Sir, I move:

That the Bill be passed.

The question was put and the motion was adopted.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now, message from the Lok Sabha.

MESSAGES FROM LOK SABHA

(I) The Appropriation (No. 5) Bill, 2006.

(II) The Appropriation (No. 6) Bill, 2006.

SECRETARY-GENERAL: Sir, I have to report to the House the following messages received from the Lok Sabha, signed by the Secretary-General of the Lok Sabha:

(I)

"In accordance with the provisions of rule 96 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha, I am directed to enclose the Appropriation (No. 5) Bill, 2006, as passed by Lok Sabha at its sitting held on the 12th December, 2006.

The Speaker has certified that this Bill is a Money Bill within the meaning of article 110 of the Constitution of India."

(II)

"In accordance with the provisions of rule 96 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha, I am directed to enclose the